



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ning of his career he was *not* for the *abolition*, but opposed to the *extension*, of slavery."

This does not detract, I think, from the credit that should be given him for his final position, which was deliberately chosen and deeply sincere. Whatever the motive or opinion which caused his reluctance and delay, the double effect of his action was that he not only saved the Union but the slave; and immortal fame is his reward.

C. W. DUSTIN.

DAYTON, OHIO.

[Our correspondent, whose interesting citations we are happy to print, seems to us to be quibbling. We never said or implied that Lincoln's views on the problem of abolition underwent no development. Of course they did. Nor have we at any time said that Lincoln was an "*eager* idealist." We merely said he was an "*idealist*"—an unqualified assertion which we perceive no occasion to withdraw.—EDITOR.]

THE HONEY AND THE BEE

SIR,—In THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for February, in the article "The Case of Hiram Johnson: Guilty," by Alfred Holman, appear two statements concerning the *Sacramento Bee* and myself, as its publisher, in connection with what the author terms "the campaign attitude of Governor Johnson's subsidized papers."

The first is that "The *Bee* supported President Wilson and Governor Johnson with equal ardor." The second is that I, as President of the State Reclamation Board, receive a per diem of twenty dollars. The inference sought to be conveyed is that the emoluments of the office are large; that because of that fact the *Bee* is guided in its editorial policy by Governor Johnson; and that its alleged advocacy of Wilson furnishes proof of Johnson's alleged betrayal of Hughes.

The first statement referred to is untrue. The second is one of those vicious half-truths less forgivable than a deliberate untruth.

The *Sacramento Bee* did not support Wilson, either with ardor or at all. It strongly disapproved of a number of his policies and actions. It was sincerely desirous, as an independent and progressive newspaper, of finding some justification for the support of Mr. Hughes. Unfortunately, Mr. Hughes offered neither justification nor excuse for such a course. The *Bee* then contented itself with freely criticizing both nominees. Its editorial published a week before the election (October 30th), criticising the President for his policy in connection with national preparedness (copy enclosed), furnishes sufficient disproof of the statement made in the Holman article. Governor Johnson felt it his duty to support Hughes; the *Bee* saw its own duty otherwise, but declined to support Wilson.

As to the second statement in the article: The Publisher of the *Bee* has acted for five years past as the President of the State Reclamation Board, to which position he was named by Governor Johnson. There is a per diem of twenty dollars allowed members of the Board, but it is only for regular Board meetings, and may not exceed one thousand dollars in any year. The amount received by me last year was \$500. The position, while a very responsible one (the Board has charge of the State's portion of the Sacramento River flood control project calling for an ultimate expenditure

of over \$30,000,000), is practically an honorary one. With the consent of my brother, partner and co-manager, most of my time (which belongs really to the *Bee*) is given to the duties of the State office without further compensation than above indicated. The consummation of the project is of such vital importance to the State that the members of the Board consider it at once an honor and a duty thus to serve the State. My duties have called me a number of times to Washington for hearings before Congressional Committees, and in no instance has the State paid me any compensation or even my transportation across the continent. It has paid my hotel expenses in Washington, and nothing more.

These are all matters of record, and if not known to Mr. Holman should have been investigated by him before making public statement in a responsible Review.

The *Bee* has loyally supported Hiram Johnson because it believes him to be the ablest, as he certainly is the most progressive, Governor the State has known. It has neither asked, nor accepted, for itself or its friends, political compensation therefor. Its publisher was appointed on the Reclamation Board presumably because of his knowledge of and interest in the project of which the Board has charge. And both Governor and publisher have performed their respective duties in connection with the project in the best interests of the State as they saw them, as would business men, and without political trade or consideration.

V. S. McCLATCHY.

SACRAMENTO, CAL.

THE CHURCH AND THE THINKING MAN

SIR,—The writer has read with much interest Dr. McConnell's article, "What are the Churches to do?" in the March number of the REVIEW.

This question seems to be based upon the assumption that the churches have creeds which are no longer tenable, and to which thinking men do not and cannot subscribe. And the writer understands Dr. McConnell to mean that the churches recognize that his assumption is in fact true.

If the Doctor's assumption is true, and is so recognized by the churches, then it seems to the writer that the answer to his question should be: Let the churches disorganize, since they are living a lie. If the churches do not so believe, then his advice to them to retain their creeds but say nothing about them is "damned with faint praise," since his reason for their so doing is that this will enable them to gather in more members.

If the churches really believe in the inspiration of the Bible, the Divinity of Christ, and the Atonement, if they in fact believe that salvation is by grace and not by "character", then the affiliation with the Church of those who come into it because of its abandonment of those vital beliefs would be of no value, either to those individuals or to the Church.

With a little more moral courage Dr. McConnell could have told us whether or not he believes in the things which the Bible says Jesus taught and did, thus rendering it unnecessary to advise the churches on the assumption that they believed certain things, when he neglects to say that either he or the Church believes those things or does not believe them.

LESTER C. MAJORS.

MIDLAND, TEXAS.